application(s). .Each of new claims 104-107 is fully supported by the specification as filed, and no new matter has been introduced. *See, e.g.*, pages 11 and 12 of the specification.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 Have Been Obviated

As set forth on pages 2-6 of the Office Action, claims 80-103 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. These rejections have been obviated for the reasons provided below, and are respectfully traversed to the extent they may be applied to any of new claims 104-107.

To be specific, the use of the word "comprising" was objected to on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, but this term is not recited by any of new claims 104-107. On page 3, the variables C_1 and C_2 were objected to as not being defined; these variables are not present in the structures recited by the new claims. And on pages 3-6, various terms and variables were objected to as "lacking upper bounds," being incomplete, or lacking definition, and certain functional limitations were objected to. These objections have also been obviated by the cancellation of claims 80-103 and addition of new claims 104-107.

Applicants do, however, respectfully submit that the term "protecting group," which was objected to on page 3 of the Office Action, did not render the canceled claims indefinite, and does not render any of new claims 104-107 indefinite. It is respectfully submitted that the term "protecting group" has a well defined meaning that is known to those skilled in the art. Consequently, while the term may be broad in the sense that it encompass a variety of moieties, it is not indefinite. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each of new claims 104-107 satisfies the requirements of §112.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 Have Been Obviated

On pages 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 90-96 and 99-103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly anticipated by Lyttle *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* 24(14):2793-2798 (1996) ("Lyttle"), and under §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Vu *et al.*, *Bioconjugate Chemistry* 5(5):599-606 (1995) ("Vu").

As discussed during the May 9 interview, Applicants submit that these rejections should be withdrawn. To be specific, both Lyttle and Vu were published after the priority date of this application (*i.e.*, July 9, 1993), and Lyttle claims only methods, and therefore cannot be an interfering reference. *See* Interview Summary of May 9, 2000 at page 2.

For these reasons, Applicants further submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), which are set forth on pages 7-9 of the Office Action, should be withdrawn, as they were also made over Lyttle and Vu.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is believed that new claims 104-107 recite embodiments of the invention in a clear and definite manner.. It is further believed that none of the references cited by the Examiner anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each ground for rejection has been successfully obviated and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner deem it helpful, a personal or telephone interview is respectfully requested to discuss any issues that may remain.

No fees are believed to be due for the claim changes of this response. If any fees are due, however, please charge such fees to Pennie & Edmonds LLP Deposit Account No. 16-1150.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 5, 2000

45,479

Max Bachrach

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1667 K Street N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 496-4400

For: **Laura A. Coruzzi** (Reg. No. 30,742)

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2711
(212) 790-9090

Enclosure